

REMARKS

The above amendments to the above-captioned application along with the following remarks are being submitted as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated June 2, 2006 (U.S. Patent Office Paper No. 20060526). In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to give due reconsideration to this application, to indicate the allowability of the claims, and to pass this case to issue.

Status of the Claims

As outlined above, claims 2-5, 7-15, 17, and 35 stand for consideration in this application, wherein claim 6 is being canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, while claim 2 is being amended to correct formal errors and to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject invention. Claim 16 stands canceled from this application. Claims 18-34 stand withdrawn from consideration in this application. In addition, new claim 35 is hereby submitted for consideration.

All amendments to the application are fully supported therein, including Figs. 13 and 52-57 and their corresponding descriptions in the specification. Applicant hereby submits that no new matter is being introduced into the application through the submission of this response.

Formal Rejections

Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. As set forth above, claim 6 is being canceled, and therefore, this rejection is moot. Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Prior Art Rejections

The First 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection

Claims 2-15 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by George et al (US Pat. 5,774,669). As mentioned above, claim 6 is being cancelled, and therefore the rejection of claim 6 is moot. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 2-5, 7-15 and 17 for the reasons set forth below.

According to the M.P.E.P. §2131, a claim is anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102 (a), (b), and (e) only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.

Claim 2

Claim 2 now recites a method of automatically recognizing a network configuration, for automatically recognizing a device configuration on a network system having a network node including at least one or more intelligent network devices each implementing an SNMP agent and a management information base, the method comprising: a first step of sending an ICMP echo request from an administrator terminal implementing an SNMP manager to individual network devices in the network node, and detecting existence and non-existence of network devices on the basis of responses therefrom; a second step of sending to the SNMP agents in the individual network devices detected an SNMP message for inquiring whether or not the SNMP agents support plural kinds of management information bases provided, and detecting the types of the network devices in the network node based on information of success and failure of sending and receiving the SNMP message and based on combinations of the information stored in the management information bases returned, wherein the combination of the information stored in the management information bases indicate the types of network devices; a third step of acquiring a set of physical addresses of network devices connected to ports of a network device from the management information base of the network device, the network device being a type of device to have a bridge function; a fourth step of acquiring information as to physical-IP address correspondence from the management information base of a network device having a routing function; and a fifth step of recognizing at an IP level the network devices connected to each of the ports of the network device having a bridge function, based on the acquired information as to physical-IP address correspondence.

The embodiments corresponding to claim 2, particularly a second step recited in claim 2 are illustrated in Figs. 13 and 52-57. The corresponding details are described on page 83, line 12 – page 91, line 20. With respect to a second step recited in claim 2, for example, as shown in Fig. 55, SNMP message sending/receiving is performed and the returned value of a management information base interface (MIB2), a forwarding item, a bridge item, a repeater item, or a printer item is set in the TI table. More precisely, a management information base (MIB) access module creates and sends a SNMP message (Get-Request, Get-Next or Set request) to a SNMP agent running on a device. If the SNMP message is successfully

sent/received, the corresponding object name is set, and then the device is determined to support each kind of MIB such as a bridge MIB, a repeater MIB and a printer MIB, and this information is stored in the TI table. Next, a device type recognition process shown in Fig. 56 as an example is performed. As shown in Fig. 13, for example, the IP forwarding object value in the IP group and the implementation patterns of devices such as a bridge MIB, repeater MIB, and a printer MIB vary according to the combination of the devices. Thus, a type of each network device is determined by examining the combination of the above-mentioned information stored in the TI Table.

Contrary to the Examiner's allegation, George merely states in col. 3, lines 46-54 and col. 4 and lines 29-30 that other nodes on the network are discovered by, among other methods, "asking particular nodes on the network for neighbor lists, called routing tables, and then repeating the inquiry to each neighbor of a former neighbor." Also, George merely shows that the distributed hierarchical network manager system (HNMS) includes a data base module (DM) and a rule-based intelligent processor (RBIP). These statements teach or suggest nothing about sending to a SNMP agent a SNMP message for inquiring whether or not the SNMP agents support plural kinds of MIBs provided and detecting the types of the network devices based on the information of success and failure of sending and receiving the SNMP message and combination of the information stored in the MIBs.

Rather, George merely shows recognizing the relationship between network devices based on HNMS object IDs, which does not indicate the status of sending and receiving the SNMP message and combination of the information stored in the MIBs. Therefore, George does not show every element recited in claim 2. Accordingly, claim 2 is not anticipated by George.

Claims 3-5, 7-15, 17

As to dependent claims 3-5, 7-15 and 17, the arguments set forth above with respect to independent claim 2 are equally applicable here. The base claim being allowable, claims 3-5, 7-15 and 17 must also be allowable.

Claim 35

Claim 35 has the substantially same features as those of claim 2. As such, the arguments set forth above are equally applicable here. Claim 2 being allowable, claim 35 must also be allowable.


Conclusion

In view of all the above, Applicant respectfully submits that certain clear and distinct differences as discussed exist between the present invention as now claimed and the prior art references upon which the rejections in the Office Action rely. These differences are more than sufficient that the present invention as now claimed would not have been anticipated nor rendered obvious given the prior art. Rather, the present invention as a whole is distinguishable, and thereby allowable over the prior art.

Favorable reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully solicited. Should there be any outstanding issues requiring discussion that would further the prosecution and allowance of the above-captioned application, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative at the address and phone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

Stanley P. Fisher
Registration Number 24,344



Juan Carlos A. Marquez
Registration Number 34,072

REED SMITH LLP
3110 Fairview Park Drive
Suite 1400
Falls Church, Virginia 22042
(703) 641-4200

August 31, 2006
SPF/JCM/YOM